

February 19, 2004

INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number/Environmental Log Number/Title:

BC 02-0125, Log No. 02-14-046, Flinn Springs 72, LLC Boundary Adjustment with a Certificate of Compliance

2. Description of Project:

The proposal is a Boundary Adjustment with a Certificate of Compliance by Flinn Springs 72, LLC to reconfigure the lot lines between parcels A, B, and C to create smaller individual parcels (Parcel B and C) for resale of residential lots for the 9 acres on Parcels B and C. Parcel A will measure approximately 90.55 acres and will remain a vacant lot with the proposed boundary adjustment. Parcel B will measure 4.55 acres and Parcel C will measure 4.47 acres. Parcels B and C will be developed with one single-family residence. Parcels B and C will be accessed by Soldin Lane. The entire project will be served by the following agencies/districts: Padre Dam Municipal Water District, Lakeside Fire Protection District, Grossmont Union High School District, and the Cajon Valley Union General Elementary School District. The three parcels total 99.6 acres and contain vacant land with sensitive plant habitat on relatively steep slopes. The project site is located within the Metro-Lakeside Jamul segment of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) PreApproved Mitigation Area. Approximately 9 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat will be dedicated into a conservation open space easement. Furthermore, the zoning use regulation is Limited Agricultural (A70) and Specific Planning Area (S88) and the land use designation includes Intensive Agriculture (17), Multiple Rural Use (18), and Specific Plan Area (21).

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Jeff Tallman
Flinn Springs 72, LLC
2339 Pio Pico Drive
Carlsbad, CA 92008

4. Project Location:

The project site is adjacent to the Flinn Springs County Park immediately to the south and east. Furthermore, the project site is approximately one-half mile south of Interstate 8 in the Lakeside Community Planning Area within the County of San Diego, APN 396-101-03,04, & 399-010-06.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1232, Grid 4/J

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The project site is located on hills containing relatively steep slopes with elevations ranging from 900 feet to 1550 feet. All three lots are currently vacant. Diegan coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitat exist on site. Surrounding land uses include open space to the south and east, and single-family residential to the west and north.

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Lakeside
Land Use Designation:	17 (Estate Residential)
Density:	1 du/2,4 acres

Land Use Designation:	18 (Multiple Rural Use)
Density:	1 du/4,8,20 acres

Land Use Designation:	21 (Specific Plan Area)
Density:	N/A

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	A70 (Limited Agricultural)
Density:	0.5 du/2 acres
Special Area Regulation:	None

Use Regulation:	A70 (Limited Agricultural)
Density:	0.25 du/4 acres
Special Area Regulation:	None

Use Regulation:	S88 (Specific Planning Area)
Density:	0.1 du/1 acre
Special Area Regulation:	None

8. Environmental resources either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached "Environmental Analysis Form".

Biological Resources

9. Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B MS O650
San Diego, California 92123-1666

10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:

Emery McCaffery, Project Environmental Analyst, (858) 694-3704

11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed:

Permit Type/Action

Agency

Boundary Adjustment
Certificate of Compliance

County of San Diego
County of San Diego

12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:

California Department of Fish and Game.

13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:

County Staff

Karen Buller, Project Planner/Manager, Department of Planning and Land Use
Emery McCaffery, Project Environmental Analyst, Department of Planning and Land Use
Megan Hamilton, Project Staff Biologist, Department of Planning and Land Use

Consultants

Gerald Moorer, RBF Consulting, 9755 Clairemont Mesa Blvd., Suite 100,
San Diego, CA 92124

14. Initial Study Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment. However, the mitigation measures described in the attached Environmental Analysis Form have been added to the project which clearly reduce the potentially significant effects to a level below significance. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

EMERY MCCAFFERY, Environmental Analyst
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
Regulatory Planning

Date: February 19, 2004

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: February 19, 2004

PROJECT NAME: Flinn Springs 72, LLC Boundary Adjustment with a Certificate of Compliance

PROJECT NUMBER(S): BC 02-0125, Log No. 02-14-046

EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

"Potentially Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes.

"Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

"Not Applicable." County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 2.4 Non-Urban Residential and 2.6 Special Purpose and General Plan

Land Use Designations 17 Estate Residential and 21 Specific Plan Area. The General Plan (17) requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 4 acres when the average slope of the proposed parcel is greater than 265 percent and permits for a density of 0.25 dwelling units per acre when the slope of the project site is greater than 25 percent gradient and General Plan 21 requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 1 acre and permits for a density of .1 dwelling units per acre. The proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with the General Plan. The project is subject to the policies of the Lakeside Community Plan. The project proposes the use of on-site sewage disposal systems. The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Lakeside Community Plan. The current zones are A70 Limited Agricultural Use Regulation Use Regulation which requires a net minimum lot size of 2.0 and S88 Specific Plan Area which requires a net minimum lot size of 1.0. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the review of the project, no conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies have been identified. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The existing land uses in the vicinity of the proposed project range from estate residential uses and minor agricultural uses to the north, east, south and west. The proposed project is a Boundary Adjustment with a Certificate of Compliance, which is consistent with the existing character. The project is subject to conformance with the Lakeside Design Guidelines to assure compatibility with the desired community character. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a harmful effect on neighborhood character or planned land use because the existing development will not be materially altered.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community because the physical arrangement of established development is one rural uses and character. The proposed project will not require the introduction of new utilities to the area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site and adjacent parcels do not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. In addition, the proposed project site does not support prime agricultural soils, as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Therefore, no adverse impacts to resources included in this program or on prime agricultural soils will occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

Not Applicable.

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agriculture. In addition, the project and surrounding area are not zoned for agricultural use, nor is the land under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

Not Applicable.

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agriculture. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project does not involve substantial extensions of utilities such as water, sewer or new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan. The project will not induce substantial growth not consistent with County planning goals.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project will not displace existing residential uses because the site is vacant. The addition of 2 dwelling units will yield a net gain of available housing.

IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1994, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, a site visit conducted by Emery McCaffery on October 18, 2002, did not identify any features that would indicate landslides or the potential for liquefaction.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion or loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Cienaba rocky coarse sandy loam (CmE2, 9-30% slopes), Cienaba very rocky coarse sandy loam (CmrG, 30-75% slopes), Fallbrook-Vista sandy loams (FvE, 15-30% slopes), Placentia sandy loam, thick surface (PfC, 2-9% slopes). The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes. The project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion potential.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified the following on-site soils having a HIGH shrink-swell behavior: Placentia sandy loam, thick surface (PfC, 2-9% slopes). All other mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior and are identified as stable with no adverse potential for development activity. However, this proposed boundary adjustment will not involve any grading and the potential impacts as a result of development in the areas with Placentia sandy loam, thick surface (PfC, 2-9% slopes) will be avoided by compliance with the following measures and/or conditions in the Grading Ordinance Requirements Sections 87.403 and 87.410 specified at the time of the grading permit issuance. A soils report with compaction test is required for all fill that is

over 12 inches in depth. DPL Form #73, Certification of Fill Compaction Report, completed by a registered engineer is to be submitted after the grading has been done.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

Less Than Significant Impact.

On a site visit completed by Emery McCaffery on October 18, 2002, no significant geological features were identified on-site. No known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Since no unique geologic features are present on the site, no adverse impacts will result from the proposed project.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not result in a loss of availability of mineral resources that could be of value to the region. Although, the project is located in a mineral resource area, known as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3), as identified on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996), the proposed boundary adjustment will not result in any grading or mining operations.

V. WATER RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

Not Applicable.

The proposed boundary adjustment will not violate any waste discharge requirements since only a lot line change will occur. No surface disturbance of any kind will result from this project. Furthermore, the project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB).

2. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

Not Applicable.

The proposed Boundary Adjustment is not tributary to an already impaired water body as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list.

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Boundary Adjustment plat has approval from the Department of Environmental Health (DEH) for water service, therefore the proposed boundary adjustment will not result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system. Furthermore, the proposed lot line adjustment does not require the need for local imported water systems.

4. Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

Yes.

The project as designed will meet the performance standards of the ordinance for flow control and erosion, and surface and ground water quality. See questions 1, 2 and 5 through 9 of this section for more detailed rationale. Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in any surface disturbance, thus will not affect stormwater quality.

5. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project as designed will meet the performance standards of the ordinance for flow control and erosion, and surface and ground water quality. See questions 1, 2 and 5 through 9 of this section for more detailed rationale. Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will

not result in any surface disturbance, thus will not substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

6. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project as designed will meet the performance standards of the ordinance for flow control and erosion, and surface and ground water quality. See questions 1, 2 and 5 through 9 of this section for more detailed rationale. Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in any surface disturbance, thus will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

7. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

Not Applicable.

The proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in surface disturbance of any kind as only the lot lines will be relocated, thus the proposed project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

8. Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

Not Applicable.

The project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff. In addition the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff offsite. The proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in surface disturbance of any kind as only the lot lines will be relocated.

9. Would the proposal provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Not Applicable.

The project does not propose any known additional sources of polluted runoff. In addition the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff offsite.

10. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

Not Applicable.

The project will obtain its water supply from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply. Furthermore, Boundary Adjustments are not subject to the Groundwater Ordinance.

11. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

Not Applicable.

The project will obtain its water supply from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply. Furthermore, Boundary Adjustments are not subject to the Groundwater Ordinance.

12. Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

The project will obtain its water supply from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply. Furthermore, Boundary

Adjustments are not subject to the Groundwater Ordinance. Therefore, the proposed project does not need to comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance.

VI. AIR QUALITY

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No significant source of either stationary or indirect air pollutants has been identified from the project. The primary source of air pollutants would be generated from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 0 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). Therefore, the vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. No other potential sources of air pollutants have been identified from the project. Additionally, the project is not expected to emit any toxic air contaminant or particulate matter based on project description and information submitted.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Based on a site visit conducted on October 18, 2002 by Emery McCaffery, the project is not located near any identified source of noxious emissions and will not expose people to excessive levels of air pollutants.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

Not Applicable.

This proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity since it only involves a reconfiguration of the lot lines.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

Not Applicable.

This proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety since it only involves a reconfiguration of the lot lines.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with The Zoning Ordinance.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Not Applicable.

This proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists since it only involves a reconfiguration of the lot lines.

VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Lakeside Lilac (*Ceanothus cyaneus*) a narrow endemic species was observed onsite (Biological Resource Analysis, November 2003). It is assumed from the biological survey completed by Vincent Scheidt in May 2002 that most of the specimens were observed in the larger parcel to the east and thus will not be impacted by any potential development associated with this boundary adjustment. The exact location of this species, however, was never determined due to the entire site being recently burned due to the wildfires that occurred in San Diego County in October 2003. It is unlikely that positive identification of this species could occur for several years. Therefore, it has been assumed that impacts to narrow endemic species have been avoided.

Habitat evaluation for the Quino Checkerspot Butterfly (federally endangered) was conducted (Michael Klein March, 2003) with the conclusion that the site be excluded from protocol surveys due to the density of the chaparral.

The project site contains sensitive species including Rush-like Bristleweed, Engelmann Oak, Ashy Spike-moss, Cooper's hawk and Orange-throated Whiptail. The species observed onsite are considered adequately conserved if appropriate habitat-based mitigation is applied. The project proposes 9.0 acres of onsite open space that is contiguous with Crestridge Ecological Preserve providing linkage to the south and east. This open space dedication is for 6.0 acres of impacts to coastal sage-chaparral scrub and is mitigated in accordance with the BMO at a ratio of 1.5:1.

Other mitigation measures have been required to reduce edge effects associated with the project by placing structures at least 100 ft away from the open space easement, and requiring permanent fencing and signage of the open space. As mentioned above, impacts to habitat were mitigated at the ratios required by the BMO, which would presumably ensure the long-term viability of any covered species and thus there is no adverse effect on any endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats.

2. Does the project comply with the Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

The Resource Protection Ordinance is not applicable to this project.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers? Is the project in conformance with wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The largest parcel east of the potential development associated with the boundary adjustment contains a drainage swale and associated coast live oak woodland habitat classified as a Resource Protection Ordinance wetland. No impacts to wetlands will result from this project. The swale and an appropriate will be placed in an open space easement as a result of mitigation for this project. Furthermore, this project is not subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance.

4. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site contains a drainage and associated coast live oak woodland that will not be impacted, and the proposed development will not discharge into and/or restrict or divert the movement of any known watershed including, but not limited to, rivers, lakes, streams, creeks, channels, or wetlands where the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintains jurisdiction over. The project proposes complete avoidance of all jurisdictional waters and wetlands by placing these watersheds in a biological open space easement with an appropriate biological buffer of at least 100 ft. Therefore, no significant impacts will occur to wetlands or watersheds that are California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional waters.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

The contiguous block of Pre Approved Mitigation Areas of the MSCP to the south and east of the site qualifies as a regional linkage. The impacts to coastal sage-chaparral scrub that are associated with the potential development associated with this boundary adjustment will not adversely affect or impede this valuable linkage. In fact, the approximately 5000 ft wide existing linkage will be increased by 80 to 400 ft through the designation of open space. Included in this open space designation are steep slopes and an identified local wildlife corridor providing a route between Flinn Springs and Crestridge. This 700 to 800 ft wide by 400 ft long corridor that supports coast live oak woodland and coastal sage-chaparral scrub will allow local wildlife movement between Flinn Springs and Crestridge and includes a drainage (wetland resource) from rim to rim.

Although 830 linear feet of frontage between the two natural areas will be obstructed by future site development, 705 ft of frontage is preserved in open space and there is a remaining 867 ft of frontage further to the east that is not affected by this project. Thus this boundary adjustment and associated potential development should not interfere substantially with established wildlife corridors.

6. Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?

Yes.

The project has been found to conform to the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan, the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO) and the Implementation Agreement between the County of San Diego, the CA Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Please refer to the Findings of Conformance for this project.

7. Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?

Not Applicable.

The proposed project and any off-site improvements are located within the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore,

conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required.

IX. HAZARDS

1. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Not Applicable.

The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In addition, an internal review of existing data and a field visit to the project site did not indicate the presence of any historic burnsites, landfills, or uses that may have contributed to potential site contamination. Therefore, no significant hazard to the public or the environment is expected to occur due to project implementation.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

Not Applicable.

The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

Not Applicable.

The project will not significantly increase the fire hazard because it will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Division 5, Chapter 3 and Appendix II-A, Section 16 of the Uniform Fire Code. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process.

4. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed Boundary Adjustment will not expose people or property to flooding. No surface disturbance of any kind will result from this project and the project site is located on steep slopes above any area prone to flooding.

4. Does the project comply with the Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

The Resource Protection Ordinance does not apply to Boundary Adjustments.

5. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Not Applicable.

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

6. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Not Applicable.

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

7. Is the project within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste in a quantity equal to or greater than that specified in subdivision (a) of Section 25536 of the Health and safety Code? Or, does the project involve the proposal of a school that is within one-quarter mile of a facility that exhibits the above characteristics?

Not Applicable.

The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

8. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Not Applicable.

The proposed project is not located within any airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that has not adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

9. For project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Not Applicable.

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (1 mile) of a private airstrip. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

X. NOISE

1. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Not Applicable.

The project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas (NSA) to road, airport, heliport, or railroad noise in excess of the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA.) based on a staff review by John Bennett.

Project implementation is not expected to expose existing noise sensitive areas to noise 10 decibels CNEL over existing levels.

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project's property line.

Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in any noise impacts as no grading or construction will occur.

2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Not Applicable.

The project would not generate potentially significant adverse groundborne vibration or noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Excluding ground vibration from motor vehicles, trains, aircraft, or temporary construction, groundborne noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit.

Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in any noise impacts as no grading or construction will occur.

3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Not Applicable.

The project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations based on a staff review by John Bennett.

Project implementation is not expected to expose existing noise sensitive areas to noise 10 decibels CNEL over existing ambient noise levels.

Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in any noise impacts as no grading or construction will occur.

4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Not Applicable.

The project would not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations based on a staff review by John Bennett.

Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in any noise impacts as no grading or construction will occur.

5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Not Applicable.

Project implementation is not expected to expose people living and working in the project area to excessive noise levels, because the County Geographic Mapping Application shows that the project lies outside of the 60-decibel CNEL noise contour of the airport and its proposed allowed use does not generate any potentially significant noise levels based on a staff review of the project by John Bennett.

Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in any noise impacts as no grading or construction will occur.

6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Not Applicable.

Project implementation is not expected to expose people living and working at the project site to excessive noise levels, because the County Geographic Mapping Application shows that the project lies outside of the 60-decibel CNEL noise contour of the airport and its proposed use would

not generate any excessive noise levels based on a staff review of the project by John Bennett.

Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in any noise impacts as no grading or construction will occur.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the proposal create potentially significant adverse effects on, or result in the need for new or significantly altered services or facilities? This could include a significantly increased maintenance burden on fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public services or facilities. Also, will the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities are available or adequate to serve the project: Padre Dam Municipal Water District (water). The project is accessed by an existing private road easement from Old Highway 80 for Parcels "A" and "B" and an existing private road easement from Soldin Lane for Parcel "C".

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;
Communication systems;
Water treatment or distribution facilities;
Sewer or septic tanks;
Storm water drainage;
Solid waste disposal;
Water supplies?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not result in the need for significant new distribution systems or substantial alterations to existing systems because the existing utility systems listed above are available to serve the proposed project. The Padre Municipal Water District will provide water, and on-site sewage disposal systems will provide sewer. See Section X for specific details on availability and/or conditions.

XIII. AESTHETICS

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is approximately one-half mile from Interstate 8, a Second Priority Scenic Route. The proposed project will not impact the scenic highway since no grading or surface disturbance will result from this Boundary Adjustment. Therefore, the site does not need to be subjected to scenic corridor protection measures since there will be no adverse visual effect. However, the project does include development standards through the design review process to ensure that adequate visual screening is provided.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed Boundary Adjustment will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project does not propose any grading or development on steep slopes. Therefore, the Boundary Adjustment will have no visual impact from landform modification or grading.

3. Does the project comply with the Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

The Resource Protection Ordinance does not apply to Boundary Adjustments.

4. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

Not Applicable.

The proposed project is a Boundary Adjustment and no structures or materials would be created to produce a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101).

XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

Not Applicable.

A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources. Furthermore, the proposed Boundary Adjustment will not result in surface disturbance of any kind.

2. Does the project comply with the Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable.

The Resource Protection Ordinance does not apply to Boundary Adjustments.

3. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:
 - a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;
 - b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);
 - c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;
 - d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or
 - e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The property was surveyed by a County of San Diego certified archaeologist/historian, Mary Robbins-Wade, RPA, Director of Cultural Resources, with Affinis Environmental Services, and it has been determined that the property does not contain any archaeological/historical sites. The results of their survey are contained in a letter archaeological report dated December 17, 2002.

XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE

None.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant Impact.

As discussed in Section VIII, Biological Resources, Questions 1., 2., 3., 4., 5., 6. and 7., and Section XIV, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Questions 1., 2., and 3., the project will not degrade the quality of the environment and will not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. The project will not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and will not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Also, the project would not reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal and will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that no significant unmitigated environmental impacts will result from the project. Thus, all long-term environmental goals have been addressed.

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less Than Significant Impact.

The incremental impacts of the project have not been found to be cumulatively considerable after an evaluation of all potential impacts. After careful review, there is no substantial evidence that any of the incremental impacts of the project are potentially significant. The impacts of the project have therefore not been found to be cumulatively considerable. The potential combined environmental impacts of the project itself have also been considered in reaching a conclusion that the total cumulative effect of such impacts is insignificant.

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This conclusion is based on the analysis completed in Sections: I, Land Use and Planning; III, Population and Housing; IV, Geologic Issues; V, Water Resources; VI, Air Quality; VII, Transportation/Circulation; IX, Hazards; X, Noise; XI, Public Services; XII, Utilities and Services; and XIII, Aesthetics. In totality, these analyses have determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier CEQA analyses are used where one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.

1. Earlier analyses used: None.
2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: None.

3. Mitigation measures: None.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

RBF Consulting, "Biological Resources Analysis Flinn Springs B/C 02-0125", dated November 2003, prepared by Gerald Moorer

Affinis Environmental Services, "Flinn Springs 72 Parcel – Boundary Adjustment – Archaeology (Affinis Job No. 1731), dated December 17, 2002, prepared by Mary Robbins-Wade

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division
Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7,
Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701 through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b, Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through 36.437)

County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426, County Codes §§ 67801 et seq.), February 20, 2002

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300 through 6314, Section 6330-6340)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology